

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE A26NEW YORK TIMES  
26 December 1985**Letters****U.S. Has a Continuing Interest in the Philippines**

To the Editor:

I disagree with the way Tom Wicker (column, Dec. 13) answered his rhetorical question why Secretary of State George P. Shultz did not include the Philippines among countries that should receive Western support, including covert military aid, to fight domestic Communist forces.

To compare Angola, Afghanistan, Cambodia and Nicaragua on one hand to the Philippines on the other is a simplistic generalization. A closer scrutiny would suggest a world of difference between them.

One obvious answer to Mr. Wicker's question is that the U.S. does not need to give covert military aid to the Philippines because it has been giving overt military aid under military agreements between the countries.

However, I can accept Mr. Wicker's thesis that preservation of American facilities in Philippine military

bases undoubtedly requires the preservation of a pro-U.S. government. One could hardly imagine the continued existence of such bases in the event of a Communist takeover. Mr. Wicker says that the "complex case of the Philippines suggests again that mere anti-Communism is not always a sufficient base for intelligent policy." How true. The cases of Ngo Dinh Diem and Lon Nol are too recent to be forgotten.

As a career diplomat, I would like to emphasize that the interests of the United States and the Philippines transcend personalities in the special presidential elections scheduled for Feb. 7. At stake is the future of a country strategically important to the United States and whose people basically share American values and aspirations.

JUAN V. SAEZ  
Philippine Ambassador to the U.N.  
New York, Dec. 13, 1985